CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE *VITA SANCTI PAULI* BY JEROME

BY
LEO MAX KAISER
A.B., Saint Louis University, 1940
A.M., University of Illinois, 1941

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
CLASSICS IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1943

URBANA, ILLINOIS
1943

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE *VITA SANCTI PAULI* BY JEROME

BY
LEO MAX KAISER
A.B., Saint Louis University, 1940
A.M., University of Illinois, 1941

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
CLASSICS IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1943

URBANA, ILLINOIS
1943

PREFACE

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. W. A. Oldfather at whose suggestion this study has been made. His criticisms have prevented the writer from falling too often under the dictum: *Hominis est errare, insipientis perseverare.*

Many hours of study and many pages of research have already gone into the questions and problems relating to a critical text of the *Vita Pauli* alone of the three *Vitae* written by Jerome. It had approached the stage where Dr. Oldfather, under whose guidance these studies in the *Vitae Eremitarum* are being made, saw like Antony, the end of the quest—*procul lumen intuitus.*

But such was not immediately to be the case. In the process of preparing a preliminary draft of the text, it was found that certain points, treated necessarily as of secondary importance by the previous doctorands engaged in settling the basic problems, were deserving of further attention and detailed study. These problems the writer has endeavored to solve. They will be outlined in brief in the following pages.

I. VERSION *a* AND THE PARALLEL LATIN *VITA*

At a very early date, probably within the lifetime of Jerome himself, and possibly but a few weeks after the composition of the *Vita Pauli*, a Greek translation of it, which we call version *a*, was made. The identity of the translator is unknown. Also a second, and independent translation once existed, at least one chapter of which still survives in Ms. 7.

Since the earliest Latin manuscript, the Veronensis, is dated 517 A.D., the original of Version *a* is by far the earliest representative of the *Vita Pauli* which we possess, antedating all Latin manuscripts by at least a century and a quarter. From this fact alone to Version *a* must be attributed considerable importance. But in the preparation of a critical text of the *Vita Pauli*, some form of an exact relationship between *a* and the Latin manuscripts must be posited as a working hypothesis.

It is immediately noticeable that Version *a* is considerably shorter than the *Vita* of the Latin manuscripts. This point will be taken up later. But where *a* and the Latin manuscripts have essentially the same text, it is found that in all but a few cases where there is an exact and close correspondence between them, and that where variants exist in the Latin, Version *a* frequently preserves the best and oldest form of the text, a fact which a varying number of different Latin manuscripts regularly confirms.

In all cases the readings of *a* are apparently as good as those of the oldest Latin manuscripts, and once in a while superior to them. At times *a* is our only clue to the original readings, since corresponding readings in the Latin are sometimes found in manuscripts of little general importance in the preparation of the text.

For these reasons, Version *a* must be considered by an editor as representing the oldest and sometimes also best manuscript of the *Vita Pauli*. Its readings will have to be con-

sulted first; then those of the more reliable Latin manuscripts. Outside of the conclusions reached by Dr. Katherine Tubbs Corey regarding the Latin manuscripts, which the results of our study confirm, we find the following manuscripts in frequent agreement with *a*, where textual difficulties are conspicuous: 85 (unclassified) ; 72 (K) ; 97 (I) ; 77 (L) ; 89 (W) ; 90 (Q) ; and 19 (Z).

II. DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN *a* AND THE LATIN MANUSCRIPTS IN SUBJECT-MATTER

Occasionally we find disagreement in subject-matter between Version *a* and the Latin manuscripts. It is to be noted, however, that in all these cases the Greek preserves much simpler and more natural modes of expression than does the Latin. The significance of this fact will be seen when we discuss the differences in the amount of material in *a* and the Latin manuscripts.

III. DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN *a* AND THE LATIN MANUSCRIPTS IN THE AMOUNT OF MATERIAL

In all the instances where the Latin manuscripts retain a fuller account than *a*, we note that this material is of a descriptive or poetic nature, or has the manner of parenthetical, explanatory remarks. This appears to be pretty consistently the case. We are thus allowed only to conclude that in the Latin we have a separate edition from the Greek—one with a good deal of rhetorical ornament in evidence. It seems very probable, then, that the *Vita* of the Latin manuscripts represents a *later* edition which, including as it does, not a few romantic, adventurous details, was made by Jerome to enlarge his reading public by touching the heart of his readers with items of human interest. The *Vita* represented by the Greek, compared with the Latin, could hardly in reason be said to be an attempt to popularize the story of Paul. It is rather sober and calm appealing to readers of a more disciplined taste, whereas the Latin contains several elements designed to appeal to a large, general class of readers. The latter probably, then,

represents an astonishingly successful edition which became so popular that only this revised version existed at all in the West.

An additional proof that the Latin probably represents a later, popularized edition is found in the fact that, just as in the case of the *Vita Hilarionis*, the difference between the two editions (in the case of the *Vita Pauli*, the edition represented by the Greek, and that of the Latin manuscripts), is rather strongly emphasized in the beginning of the two editions. That is, in the *Vita* of the Latin manuscripts, far more revision in the way of additional material is found in its beginning than in its middle or end. Jerome made an enthusiastic beginning, furnishing many more interesting details for a second edition; then his interest waned, and the middle and end show considerably less evidence of rewriting.

IV. THE SLIGHTLY LONGER AND THE SLIGHTLY SHORTER LATIN TEXTS

In the course of an examination of the Latin manuscripts it was found that not infrequently certain ones of them contain longer statements longer usually by the addition of a single word, or even several words. The possibility arose, then, that once there might have been in existence a slightly longer and a slightly shorter version of the *Vita*, that is, two slightly varying editions, as is well known to be the case with the text of the *Vita Hilarionis*.

Ninety-seven instances of these longer reading were examined which were not found either in Version *a*, or in the great majority of the Latin manuscripts. But upon examination only twenty-five per cent were found to make the meaning definitely easier and simpler, assuming that this was the reason for the appearance of a longer version. Moreover, the manuscript authority for these easier readings was not at all consistent, the family of manuscripts which appeared oftenest as the basis of authority, i e., family C, itself recording only a fifty per cent agreement, i.e., family C, itself recording only The results were very much the same after examining the

manuscript authority for all ninety-seven longer readings.

No one family, comprising a number of manuscripts, consistently supported or agreed with any other family, which also included a number of manuscripts. In other words, we have insufficient agreement between families and groups to warrant the hypothesis of two different and consistent traditions in the Latin manuscripts, one regularly longer, the other pretty uniformly shorter.

VITA

Leo Max Kaiser was born December 5, 1918 at St. Louis, Missouri. He attended St. Augustine's Parochial School there, and the St. Louis University High School, graduating from the latter institution in June, 1936. In the fall of 1936 he matriculated at St. Louis University, from which he received the A.B. degree in Classics, *summa cum laude*, among the first students of the Great Books Program, in June, 1940. In the fall of 1940, he entered the University of Illinois on a graduate scholarship, receiving the A.M. degree in Classical Languages in June, 1941. He has held graduate fellowships for the years 1941-42, and 1942-43, pursuing his studies under Profs. W. A. Oldfather, H. V. Canter, B. E. Perry, H. Gomperz, H. A. Sanders, and L. E. Lord. He is a member of Sastores and Eta Sigma Phi.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41549818_0186